

A SHRINKING LEMMA FOR INDEXED LANGUAGES

ROBERT H. GILMAN

ABSTRACT. This article presents a lemma in the spirit of the pumping lemma for indexed languages but easier to employ.

SECTION 1. INTRODUCTION.

The pumping lemma for context-free languages has been extended to stack languages [O] and indexed languages [H], but these generalizations are rather complicated. In this article we take a slightly different approach by concentrating only on that part of the context-free pumping lemma which says that if $uvwxy \in L$, then $uwy \in L$, and by employing a theorem on divisibility of words which is not used in [O] or [H]. Our result, Theorem A, is relatively easy to state and strong enough to verify the examples given in [H] of languages which are not indexed. On the other hand it does not afford a proof that the finiteness problem for indexed languages is solvable as does [H, Theorem 5.1].

Indexed languages were introduced by Aho [A1], [A2]. A brief introduction appears in [HU, Chapter 14]. Our original motivation for Theorem 1 was the investigation of finitely generated groups for which the language of words defining the identity is indexed.

SECTION 2. A RESULT ON INDEXED LANGUAGES.

Before stating our result we fix some notation. Σ is a finite alphabet, $|w|$ is the length of $w \in \Sigma^*$, and for each $a \in \Sigma$, $|w|_a$ is the number of a 's in w .

Theorem A. *Let L be an indexed language over Σ and m a positive integer. There is a constant $k > 0$ such that each word $w \in L$ with $|w| \geq k$ can be written as a product $w = w_1 \cdots w_r$ for which the following conditions hold.*

- (1) $m < r \leq k$.
- (2) The factors w_i are nonempty words.

The author was partially supported by NSF grant DMS-9401090.

- (3) *Each choice of m factors is included in a proper subproduct which lies in L .*

By (3) we mean that the chosen factors occur in a product $w_{i_1} \cdots w_{i_t} \in L$ with $1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_t \leq r$ and $m \leq t < r$. The proof of Theorem A is given in the next section.

Corollary 1. *Let L be an indexed language. There is a constant $k > 0$ such that if $w \in L$ and $|w| > k$, then there exists $v \in L$ with $(1/k)|w| \leq |v| < |w|$.*

Proof. Take $m = 1$ in Theorem A and choose a factor of maximum length. $\square$

By taking m to be the number of letters in Σ and arguing similarly we obtain a result on the Parikh mapping.

Corollary 2. *Let L be an indexed language over Σ . There is a constant $k > 0$ such that if $w \in L$ and $|w| > k$, then there exists $v \in L$ with $(1/k)|w|_a \leq |v|_a \leq |w|_a$ for each $a \in \Sigma$ and $|v|_a < |w|_a$ for some $a \in \Sigma$.*

Corollary 1 has the following immediate consequence.

Corollary 3. [H, Theorem 5.2] *If f is a strictly increasing function on the positive integers, and $L = \{a^{f(n)}\}$ is an indexed language, then $f = O(k^n)$ for some positive integer k .*

Corollary 4. [H, Theorem 5.3] *The language $L = \{(ab^n)^n \mid n \geq 1\}$ is not indexed.*

Proof. Suppose L is indexed, and apply Theorem A to L with $m = 1$. Pick $w = (a^n b)^n$ with $n > k$ and consider the decomposition $w = w_1 \cdots w_r$. As $r \leq k$, at least one factor w_i must contain two or more a 's. Choose that w_i to be in the proper subproduct v . But then v contains a subword $ab^n a$, which is impossible as $v \neq w$. $\square$

SECTION 3. PROOF.

The proof of Theorem A depends on a result about divisibility of words. We say that v divides w and write $v \prec w$ if v is a subsequence of w . For example $ac \prec abc$. By a theorem of Higman [SS, Theorem 6.1.2] every set of words defined over a finite alphabet and pairwise incomparable with respect to divisibility is finite. We will use this result in the following form.

Lemma 1. *Let m be a positive integer and Y a language over a finite alphabet Δ . Y contains a finite subset X with the property that for any*

$y \in Y - X$ with m letters distinguished there is an $x \in X$ such that $x \preceq y$ and x includes all the distinguished letters of y .

Proof. Let Δ' be the union of Δ with m pairwise disjoint copies of itself, and define Y' be the language of all words over Δ' which project to Y and contain exactly one letter from each of the m copies of Δ . By Higman's theorem X' , the set of all words in Y' each of which is not divisible by any word in Y' except itself, is finite. For any $y' \in Y'$ if we take x' to be a word of minimum length among all words in Y' dividing y' , then $x' \in X'$. Further x' contains all the letters of y' from $\Delta' - \Delta$.

Define X to be the union of the projection of X' to Δ^* with the set of all words in Y of length less than m . Suppose that $y \in Y - X$ has m distinguished letters. Since $|y| \geq m$, we can pick $y' \in Y'$ projecting to y so that the distinguished letters of y correspond to the letters of y' in $\Delta' - \Delta$. By the preceding paragraph y' is divisible by an $x' \in X'$ which contains those letters. It follows that the projection of x' to Σ^* is the desired word x . $\square$

Notice that x might be a subsequence of y in more than one way. Lemma 1 asserts only that there is some subsequence of y which includes the distinguished letters and whose product is x .

Fix an indexed language L over Σ , and let G be an indexed grammar for L . Let G have sentence symbol S , nonterminals N , and indices F . $(NF^* + \Sigma)^*$ is the set of sentential forms. By [A1, Theorem 4.5] we may assume G is in normal form, i.e.,

- (1) S does not appear on the righthand side on any production;
- (2) There are no ϵ -productions except perhaps $S \rightarrow \epsilon$;
- (3) Each production has one of the forms $A \rightarrow BC$, $Af \rightarrow B$, $A \rightarrow Bf$, or $A \rightarrow a$, where $A, B, C \in N$, $f \in F$, and $a \in \Sigma$.

We are using the definition of indexed grammar from [HU]; this definition is slightly different from the original.

We write $\alpha \xrightarrow{*} \beta$ to indicate that the sentential form β can be derived from the sentential form α via productions of G , and we use $\beta \cdot \omega$ to denote the sentential form obtained by appending the index string ω to the index string of every nonterminal in the sentential form β . It follows from the way derivations are defined in indexed grammars that if $\alpha \xrightarrow{*} \beta$, then $\alpha \cdot \omega \xrightarrow{*} \beta \cdot \omega$. Conversely if $\alpha \cdot \omega \xrightarrow{*} \beta \cdot \omega$ and if every nonterminal occurring in that derivation has an index string with suffix ω , then $\alpha \xrightarrow{*} \beta$.

Lemma 2. *Let m be a positive integer and $A\omega$ a sentential form in NF^* . There is a finite set of sentential forms $X \subset (N + \Sigma)^*$ with the property that*

if $A\omega \xrightarrow{*} \beta \in (N + \Sigma)^* - X$, and m symbols of β are distinguished, then there is $\alpha \in X$ such that $A\omega \xrightarrow{*} \alpha \not\preceq \beta$, and α includes all the distinguished symbols of β .

Proof. Apply Lemma 1 to the language of all sentential forms in $(N + \Sigma)^*$ derivable from $A\omega$. $\square$

Consider a derivation $S \xrightarrow{*} w \in L$, and let Γ be the corresponding derivation tree. Let each vertex p of Γ have label $\lambda(p)$, and define a subtree $\Gamma(p)$ with root p as follows. If $\lambda(p)$ is a terminal or nonterminal, then $\Gamma(p)$ consists of p and all its descendants. Otherwise $\lambda(p) = Af\omega$ for some nonterminal A , index f , and string of indices ω . In this case along each path emanating from p there will be a first vertex, perhaps a leaf of Γ , at which f is consumed. Define $\Gamma(p)$ to be the union of all the paths from p up to and including these first vertices. The subtrees $\Gamma(p)$ play an important role in [H]; we will use them here in a slightly different way than they are used there.

Let $\gamma(p)$ be the sentential form obtained by concatenating the labels of the leaves of $\Gamma(p)$ in order; if p is a leaf, $\gamma(p) = \lambda(p)$. Since $\Gamma(p)$ is a subtree of a derivation tree, $\lambda(p) \xrightarrow{*} \gamma(p)$. If $\lambda(p) = Af\omega$, then by construction all vertices of $\Gamma(p)$ except its leaves have labels of the form $B\omega'f\omega$. The leaves are labelled by terminals or labels form $B\omega$. Deleting all the suffixes ω yields a derivation tree for $Af \xrightarrow{*} \beta(p)$ where $\gamma(p) = \beta(p) \cdot \omega$. Extend the definition of $\beta(p)$ to all other vertices p of Γ by defining $\beta(p) = \gamma(p)$ when $\lambda(p)$ is a terminal or nonterminal.

It follows from Lemma 2 that there is a finite set of sentential forms $Z \subset (N + \Sigma)^*$ such that for any of the finitely many sentential form $A\omega \in N \cup NF$ if $A\omega \xrightarrow{*} \beta \in (N + \Sigma)^* - Z$ and m symbols of β are distinguished, then there is $\alpha \in Z$ such that $A\omega \xrightarrow{*} \alpha \not\preceq \beta$, and α includes all the distinguished symbols of β . Since it does no harm to enlarge Z , we may assume Z contains all elements of $(N + \Sigma)^*$ of length at most m .

Lemma 3. *Let $C \geq 2$ be an upper bound for the lengths of elements of Z . Suppose $\beta(p) \notin Z$ but $\beta(q) \in Z$ for all vertices q which are proper descendants of p , then $|\beta(p)| \leq C^2$.*

Proof. If p is a leaf, then $|\beta(p)| = 1$. Suppose p has two descendants, q_1, q_2 . It follows from the normal form for G that $\beta(p) = \beta(q_1)\beta(q_2)$, and consequently $|\beta(p)| \leq 2C$. Finally if p has a single descendant, q , then the derivation $\lambda(p) \xrightarrow{*} \gamma(p)$ begins with application of a production of the form $A \rightarrow a$, $Af \rightarrow B$ or $A \rightarrow Bf$. In the first case $|\beta(p)| = |a| = 1$. In the second case $\lambda(p)$ must be $Af\omega$ whence $\beta(p) = B$ and again $|\beta(p)| = 1$.

Consider the last case. We have $\lambda(p) = A\omega$ and $\lambda(q) = Bf\omega$. Further $\beta(p)$ is the product of the terms $\beta(q')$ as q' ranges over the leaves of $\Gamma(q)$. Since $\beta(q) \in Z$, there are at most C terms; and as each $\beta(q') \in Z$, we have $|\beta(p)| \leq C^2$. $\square$

To complete the proof of Theorem A choose $k = C^2 + 2$ and suppose $S \xrightarrow{*} w \in L$ with $|w| \geq k$. Let Γ be the corresponding derivation tree and p_0 its root. Clearly $\beta(p_0) = w \notin Z$, and so we may choose p to satisfy the hypothesis of Lemma 3. Note that $\beta(p) \notin Z$ implies $|\beta(p)| > m$; in particular p is not a leaf.

If $\lambda(p) = A$, then $\beta(p) = a_1 \cdots a_t$ is a subword of w and $m < t \leq C^2$. Consequently $w = w'a_1 \cdots a_tw''$ exhibits w as a product of more than m and at most k nonempty factors. Suppose m of the factors in this product are distinguished. If not all these factors are letters a_i , distinguish more letters to bring the total of distinguished letters a_i to m . By definition of Z there is a word $u \in Z$ such that $A \xrightarrow{*} u \not\preceq a_1 \cdots a_t$ and u contains all the distinguished letters of $a_1 \cdots a_t$. It follows that $v = w'uw''$ contains the distinguished factors of w and satisfies all the conditions of Theorem A.

Finally $\lambda(p) = Af\omega$ implies $\beta(p) = z_1 \cdots z_t$ with $m < t \leq C^2$ and each $z_i \in N \cup \Sigma$. Further $\gamma(p) = \beta(p) \cdot \omega$. Consequently $w = w'u_1 \cdots u_tw''$ where each u_i is the subword derived from $z_i \cdot \omega$ in the derivation $S \xrightarrow{*} w$. Because G is in normal form, none of the u_i 's is the empty word. As before there exists $\alpha \in Z$ such that $Af \xrightarrow{*} \alpha \not\preceq \beta(p)$ and α contains all the z_i 's for which u_i is distinguished. We have $\alpha \cdot \omega \xrightarrow{*} u$ where u is the subproduct of $u_1 \cdots u_t$ corresponding to the z_i 's in α . It follows that $v = w'uw''$ satisfies the conditions of Theorem A.

REFERENCES

- [A1] A. Aho, *Indexed grammars – an extension of context-free grammars*, J. ACM **15** (1968), 647-671.
- [A2] ———, *Nested stack automata*, J. ACM **16** (1969), 383-406.
- [H] T. Hayashi, *On derivation trees of indexed grammars: An extension of the uvwxy-theorem*, Publ. RIMS Kyoto Univ. **9** (1973), 61-92.
- [HU] J. E. Hopcroft and J. D. Ullman, *Introduction to Automata Theory, Languages, and Computation*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1979.
- [O] W. Ogden, *Intercalation theorems for stack languages*, Proc. First Annual ACM Symposium of the Theory of Computing (1969), 31-42.
- [SS] J. Sakarovitch and I. Simon, *Subwords*, Combinatorics on Words (M. Lothaire, ed.), Encyclopedia of Mathematics and Its Applications **17**, Addison Wesley, 1983, pp. 105-142.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, STEVENS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, HOBOKEN, NJ 07030

E-mail address: `rgilman@apollo.stevens-tech.edu`